

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FILING DATE CONFIRMATION NO. ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR P001US 3597 11/23/2000 09/721,810 Brad A. Miller 05/09/2003 1200 7590 AKIN, GUMP, STRAUSS, HAUER & FELD **EXAMINER** 711 LOUISIANA STREET MEDLEY, MARGARET B **SUITE 1900 SOUTH** HOUSTON, TX 77002 **ART UNIT** PAPER NUMBER 1714 DATE MAILED: 05/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•			<b>5</b>	~~
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		09/721,810	MILLER, BRAD A	·•
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Margaret B. Medley	1714	
<u> </u>	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	<u> </u>	with the correspondence ad	dress
Period fo	or Reply			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  Insigns of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replement of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may ly within the statutory minimum of will apply and will expire SIX (6) Me, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely ONTHS from the mailing date of this co ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30	January 2003		
2a)⊠		nis action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allow		natters prosecution as to th	e merits is
-,	closed in accordance with the practice under ion of Claims	•	· •	
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application	n.		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-23 is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.		
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)🖂	Claim(s) 1-18 and 24 is/are rejected.			
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Applicati	ion Papers			
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10) 🔲	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	pted or b) objected to b	y the Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be held in abo	eyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a)☐ approved b)☐	disapproved by the Examine	er.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in re	•		
12) 🔲	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kaminer.		
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C	c. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:			
	1. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received in	Application No	
* 5	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Buse the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)	).	Stage
	acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest	•		annlication)
a	) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro	ovisional application has	been received.	аррпсацоп).
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest	ic priority under 35 U.S.	J. 99 120 and/or 121.	
Attachment		<b>4.</b> □	ou Compress (DTO 440) De la 200	- \
2) 🔲 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _	5) Notice	w Summary (PTO-413) Paper No( of Informal Patent Application (PTC	

Art Unit: 1714

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office action is in response to Paper No. 3 dated January 30, 2003. The requested amendment for cancellation of the second set of claims 1-7, the amendments to claims 1-16, the addition on new claims 17-24 and the amendments to pages 3, 4, 9, 10 and 13 of the instant specification have been entered of record. The pending claims of record are claims 1-24.

Newly submitted claims 19-23 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: Newly submitted claims 19-23 are directed to a print film comprising a composition on both of its side.

The claims as originally presented were only directed to formulations for films and to a method for preserving a film. There were not any originally presented claims of record directed to a film print.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 19-23 will be withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

The amendment filed January 30, 2003 is objected to under the paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. The paragraph of 35 U.S.C.132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material, which is not supported by the original disclosure, is as follows: The requested amendment at page 4 line 1 for the insertion of the terms

Art Unit: 1714

"preferred" before the word formulation add is considered as new matter. It is further noted that the originally filed claims does not provide support for said amendments and applicants have not provided an explanation for the requested amendment. The requested amendment is considered as new matter.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-16 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims are rejected under the section of 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph for new matter for the same reason that the specification is rejected for the insertion of the term "preferred" at line 1 of page 4.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

Art Unit: 1714

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-18 and 24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nair et al (Nair) 5,786,134 in view of Nicholas et al (Nicholas) 5,462,459, Stowell 5,443,604, Booser's <u>Handbook of Lubrication</u> and Schey's <u>Tribology in Metal-Working</u>; "Function Lubrication and Wear" for reasons made of record in Paper No. 3 dated January 30, 2003.

Applicant's arguments filed January 30, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. second paragraph 112 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments to the claims and arguments made of record.

Applicants argue that Nair does not disclose a coating applied to the exterior surfaces of a film and more importantly teaches away from a coating which is not in contact with the film and which cannot be for the purpose of directly lubricating the film.

Applicants' arguments are not convincing in that the Nair clearly teaches that the topcoat of a film comprises paraffin-lubricating agent for the preservation of film prints. The secondary references are maintained for their teachings that conventional paraffin's comprises the compositions of the instant claims and that the compositions of the instant claims are conventional preservation compositions. The primary reference has

Art Unit: 1714

established the state of the art knowledge that paraffin lubricant agents are used as preservation agents for film prints. The 103 rejection made of record is proper and is maintained because the claims are directed to a composition and a method for the preservation of a film print and is not directed to a film print with a coating. The secondary references of Stowell, Booser, Schey and Nicholas teach the composition and properties of paraffin. The latter further teaches that the composition of Nair have been used as a conventional preservative composition for use for wood. It appears that applicants' arguments are directed to a film print having a coating applied to the exterior surfaces that is directed to the new claims 19-23 that have been withdrawn from consideration. The rejection made of record under 35 U.S.C. 103 is proper and renders the instant claims obvious.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

**Art Unit: 1714** 

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Margaret B. Medley whose telephone number is (703) 308-2518. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday--Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (703) 306-2777. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

MARGARET MEDLEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

M.B. Medley/dh May 8, 2003